

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/501,007	07/08/2004	Jacheon Lee	Q82391	1859
23373	7590 11/06/2006		EXAMINER	
	MION, PLLC	COVINGTON, RAYMOND K		
SUITE 800	YLVANIA AVENUE, N.W.	ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
WASHINGTO	ON, DC 20037		1625	<u> </u>
		•	DATE MAILED: 11/06/200	6

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

		Application No.	Applicant(s)	
		10/501,007	LEE ET AL.	
	Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit	
		Raymond Covingtor		
Period fo	The MAILING DATE of this communication	n appears on the cover st	eet with the correspondence add	dress
A SH WHIC - Exte after - If NC - Failu Any	IORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR R CHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILIN ensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 C r SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication of period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory pure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by reply received by the Office later than three months after the led patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	IG DATE OF THIS COMI FR 1.136(a). In no event, however, on. period will apply and will expire SIX statute, cause the application to be	MUNICATION. The may a reply be timely filed (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this cocome ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133)	,
Status	30 parametria (a).			
1)[Responsive to communication(s) filed on This action is FINAL . 2b) Since this application is in condition for all closed in accordance with the practice uncondition.	This action is non-final.	•	merits is
Disposit	ion of Claims		•	
5)	Claim(s) 1-8 is/are pending in the applicate 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are with Claim(s) is/are allowed. Claim(s) 1-8 is/are rejected. Claim(s) is/are objected to. Claim(s) are subject to restriction a sion Papers The specification is objected to by the Exaus The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) Applicant may not request that any objection to Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the control of the path of declaration is a bisocted to be with the control of the path of declaration is a bisocted to be with the control of the path of declaration is a bisocted to be with the path of the pat	hdrawn from consideration and/or election requireme miner. accepted or b) object to the drawing(s) be held in a correction is required if the drawing i	nt. ed to by the Examiner. abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a). rawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CF	
	The oath or declaration is objected to by the	ie Examiner. Note the att	ached Office Action or form PT	U-152.
12)⊠ a)l	Acknowledgment is made of a claim for for All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority docur 2. Certified copies of the priority docur 3. Copies of the certified copies of the application from the International Buse the attached detailed Office action for a	ments have been receive ments have been receive priority documents have ureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a))	d. d in Application No been received in this National S	Stage
2) 🔲 Notic 3) 🔯 Inforr	t(s) e of References Cited (PTO-892) e of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948 mation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SI r No(s)/Mail Date <u>7/8/04</u> .	B) Pap	rview Summary (PTO-413) er No(s)/Mail Date ce of Informal Patent Application (PTO- er:	-152)

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hoffman et al US 4,444,784 taken with Taoka et al US 6,331,641(US equivalent of WO 00/34264) in view of Dabora et al US 5,159,104

Hoffman et al teach preparing simvastin from lovastatin by hydrolysis of the lactone ring using lithium hydroxide followed by relactonization, protecting the hydroxyl group on the lactone ring, then acylation with 2,2-dialkylbutyryl acid and deprotecting the lactone hydroxyl group. See, for example, columns 5-6, column 14 line 3, which teach using tertabutylammonium fluoride and example 3. Taoka et al teach an analogous process which uses lithium hydroxide or potassium hydroxide in a 1 to 10 ratio based on lovastatin with 2,2dimethylbutyryl chloride as the acylating agent. See, for example, column 2 lines 1-65, column 3 lines 25-30, column 4 lines 40-46, and column 5 lines 33-36. Dabora et al also teaches

Application/Control Number: 10/501,007

Art Unit: 1625

analogous process for acylating using 2,2dimethylbutyryl acid or the 2,2dimethylbutyryl chloride derived therefrom. See, column 2 lines 5-15 and column 4 step c.

Hoffman et al differs from the claimed invention it uses lithium hydroxide instead of potassium hydroxide, it uses a dialkylbutyryl acid instead of a dialkylbutyryl bromide or chloride and, with respect to claim 5, it uses a tertabutylammonium fluoride instead of tertabutylammonium bromide.

However, the use of lithium hydroxide or potassium hydroxide in analogous processes is known as taught by Taoka et al. The use of dialkylbutyryl acid or dialkylbutyryl chloride is also known as taught by Taoka et al.

Further, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to use tertabutylammonium fluoride in lieu of tertabutylammonium bromide in light of their close structural similarities and their known use as acylating catalyst.

With respect to claim 8 it is well known in the art the acylation of lactones by conventional procedures involving temperatures of e.g. 100°C typically employ benezene as an inert organic solvent. Further, the use of Dean-Stark traps in processes involving benzene, particularly azeotropic separations, is also well known in the art. Note Wikipedia Dean-Stark apparatus. To apply these

Art Unit: 1625

techniques to other analogous latone acylation processes such as that recited in the claims would have been obvious as the results would not have been unexpected.

In view of the art as a whole the claimed invention would have been obvious as the results would not have been unexpected.

No claim is allowed.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Raymond Covington whose telephone number is (571) 272-0681. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Thomas McKenzie at telephone number (571) 272-0681.

The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Thomas McKenzie SPE
Art Unit 1625

RKC